

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over May apparently in view of official notice. The Advisory Action alleges that May discloses the invention as claimed wherein each level category of May's system provides a row and column heading that identifies the icons. However, Applicant respectfully submits that May does not display in the matrix area, a matrix including displayed row and column headings wherein the matrix has a plurality of cells and a plurality of icons displayed in one or more of the cells as noted, for example, in claim 1. The apparent alleged row and column headings as referred to in FIG. 12 of May are not in fact displayed column and row headings. Such information is not provided as displayed row and column headings for icons in a matrix as required by the claim. To the contrary, May requires that text be shown in icons in the display and therefore there would be no use for row headings and displayed column headings since this would be redundant with the text within the icons themselves. Having row and column headings would be duplicative. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made in the previous office actions and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance for these reasons as well.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter as noted in previous office actions.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over May in view of Burnard et al. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made in the previous responses and as such, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnard. Applicant has requested that facts upon which official notice has been taken be

provided in the form of documentation. However, this has not been provided and as such, this is not a prima facie rejection and accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance. Moreover, since the office action admits that Burnard does not disclose the user compiling the element and library without reference with non compiled data, it does not indicate where the motivation comes from or where such operation lacking in Burnard comes from. As such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

The new dependent claims 16-18 are also believed to be allowable as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and support may be found in Applicant's Specification. By way of example, as shown in the Figures (see for example, FIGs. 3 and 4), the displayed icons in one example do not have text therein and allow the icons to be smaller so that the distribution of data elements may be visually shown in a matrix making the data elements of a portion or of an entire database visually apparent in the data distribution. The claims are allowable for the subject matter claimed therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Date: 1-19-06

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005